DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 817 FL 005 932

AUTHOR Shapson, Stan M.; Purbhoo, Mary
TITLE Second Language Programmes for Young Children.
INSTITUTION Toronto Board of Education (Ontario). Research Dept.
PUB DATE Jan 74
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; English (Second Language); *Language Instruction; *Language Programs; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Student Motivation; *Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; Toronto

ABSTRACT

This report provides a selection, description, and summary of programs and research involving two languages of instruction. It identifies theoretical questions raised in the literature, but the main emphasis is on the structures, goals, and outcomes of second language programs at the elementary school level. Many issues discussed are specific to different types of programs, such as those designed to achieve bilingualism for students from dominant language groups (e.g., French or English immersion programs in Canada), as well as native language programs that utilize the mother tongue of students from minority language groups (e.g., Italian-Canadians, Spanish-Americans). Most of the native language programs reviewed have been initiated in the United States, although the changing situation in Canada and, specifically, Toronto is also included. There is a clear indication that motivational and attitudinal factors are related to the success of second language programs. In addition, social-political factors must be considered. Evidence suggests that students in second language programs do not suffer academically, especially when longitudinal comparisons are made with appropriate tests and controls. Furthermore, native language programs may have specific benefits in the domain of social and personal factors. (Author/KM)

ED 096817

FL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMMES

FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

Stan M. Shapson
Mary Purbhoo

#122

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH SERVICE

issued by the
Research Department
January 1974

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

PREFACE

The following document provides a selection, description and summary of programmes and research involving two languages of instruction. It attempts to identify the general issues raised in the literature, as well as to focus attention on factors which are specific to particular types of programmes.

Evidence suggests that a good case can generally be made in favour of second language programmes. However, the reader is alerted that this document does not provide answers to many of the theoretical questions that have been raised since the literature to date is still confusing and incomplete. In practice, the direction taken by many programmes is largely based on social, political and financial considerations.

For the people in the Toronto school system, it might also be useful to consider this report within the following framework:

(a) recently, the demand for programmes involving maintenance of native languages and cultures by ethnic groups in Toronto has been increasing. In addition, there are a number of French programmes, including a few of the immersion variety. Contained in this report is a discussion of the concerns and characteristics which distinquish a native language programme for an ethnic child in one part of the city, from an intensive French programme for an English-speaking child in another part of the city.

(b) In approving the experimental programme at General Mercer School, which involves the use of Italian as a transitional language of instruction, the Toronto Board requested that a research component be associated with the project.

This report provides background reading for those who are interested in the programme at General Mercer and in the subsequent Research Department reports, which this and other related Toronto programmes will give rise to.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMMES FOR YOUNG CHILDREN	1
Separation of Languages	2
Age and Second Language Learning	5
Influence of Bilingualism on Intelligence	6
Immersion Programmes in Canada	10
Two Unsuccessful Bilingual Programmes	14
Attitudes and Motivational Factors	17
Two Types of Children Learn Second Languages	18
The Immersion Model for Minority Language Students	19
Consequences of Dismissing Native Languages	21
Trend Toward Native Language Programmes	23
Early Experiences in Non-English-Speaking Nations	26
The Language in Which Reading is Introduced	28
Native Language Programmes in the United States	29
One-Way Versus Two-Way Bilingual Programmes	35
Two-Way Bilingual Programmes	37
Overview of Native Language Programmes in the United States	40
The Situation in Canada	43
The Situation in Toronto	45
SUMMARY	49
REFERENCES	53
APPENDIX A	59
APPENDIX B	67

SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMMES FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

"Als iemand de taal van een bericht niet kan verstaan, dan kan hij ook niet de bedoeling begrijpen; misverstand is bijna onvermijdelijk."

The difficulties encountered by anyone suddenly immersed into an unfamiliar language medium can be known only to those who have had the experience. These difficulties and the processes by which a person then begins to learn the new language are merely two elements of the many areas of concern in the field of bilingualism. For example, educators might be concerned with how to introduce the language of instruction effectively to minority language children, or how and when to teach a second language to other students. A list of other areas of concern might include the affective influences of bilingualism, on emotions, attitudes and self-worth, or theoretical considerations, such as cognitive effects, and differences between the mental processes of bilingual and monolingual persons, or the political implications of bilingualism, or the financial and administrative complexities.

"Bilingualism is so complicated a phenomenon that one has the giddy feeling that in speaking of it one speaks of all things at once." (Macnamara, 1967, p. 5)

Because bilingualism is a vast topic, and one could write extensively on almost any one aspect, this paper will be restricted to discussing programmes which use more than one language of instruction. Within this area, consideration will be given to different types of programmes or models, the people to whom they are directed, the reasons

for which they were established, the results of the programmes, and the relationship among these aspects. Because specific language programmes have usually been introduced for very practical reasons, rather than to demonstrate some theoretical issue, many of the theoretical issues can not be resolved by the programmes and are thus beyond the scope of this paper. Although this paper is basically concerned with the practical aspects of bilingualism, there are some theoretical issues which cannot be bypassed because of their implications for the implementation of second language programmes.

Separation of Languages

One of these is the question of whether or not to separate the two (or more) languages being learned. That is, how important is it that the contexts, either of persons, place or time, of two or more languages be distinct for a child. In theorizing about bilingualism, Ayala (1971) and Barkman (1969) expressed the view that the separation of the contexts of languages will produce a co-ordinate system. In the co-ordinate system, it is theorized that a concept in one language will always conjure up associations only in that same language, that is, the two sets of referents, one in each language, will function independently.

On the other hand Ayala and Barkman suggested that a compound system will develop if the two languages have not been separated. Compound bilingualism is viewed as less efficient; the reasoning behind this is that since the two languages have been mixed in the environment and since they have a single set of representational mediation processes, interference can occur. Ayala (1971) speculates that the type of confusion resulting from compound interference would be as follows: a word with only one meaning in the native language but several in another language may be incorrectly translated into

the vernacular and therefore misunderstood. Assuming that these are the steps involved, processing would necessarily be slower with a compound system of bilingualism because of the translation or extra mediation step.

It would appear that in order to ensure the development of a co-ordinate bilingual system, it would be necessary to separate the languages at the time of learning. Speaking one language at home and the other at school, or instructing in the two languages at different times of day with different instructors, could be a few practical ways of achieving the separation. Taylor (1970) suggests that a compound bilingual can eventually become co-ordinate if the two languages are gradually shifted into separate domains. Although the optimal degree of separation required to achieve the goal of co-ordinate bilingual persons is not yet known, it is probably an important administrative consideration. For example, is it sufficient or necessary to separate the two languages in time? Although many second language programmes have been established with at least some degree of separation, they have not been accompanied by any research on the distinction between co-ordinate and compound bilingualism.

Another factor which is not accounted for in the framework of separating languages is the child's own contribution. Is it important that the child himself not mix the two languages, or is it sufficient that the rest of the world not mix them? Previous investigations have demonstrated that mixing is certainly a very common feature in young children learning more than one language (Swain, 1971, 1972) and most likely cannot be prevented. In order to communicate, a child will use any tool available to him. The specific language he is using does not become relevant until he fails to be understood. In addition, since it is not possible to control the use and separation of languages in the home, does not the question of separation become one of pure academic speculation?

Varieties of mixing or code switching seem to be very common for monolingual people who have only one language at their command. Within this one language system, they have several variations which they employ as a tool to communicate with different people or in different situations. Hymes (1967) lists such varieties as whispering, loud speaking and excitement as examples of the techniques a monolingual speaker uses. Examples of switching between these variations are very easily observed both in children and in adults. It has been suggested that language switching by bilingual speakers is the same mechanism as code switching for monolingual speakers (Swain, 1971, 1972; Gumperz, 1970). Gumperz gives examples of language switching in bilingual adults which closely parallel the variations used by monolingual speakers. He considered that instances of switching were deliberate attempts to add expression to the statements and were not merely mistakes.

Swain observed language development in young children from bilingual French-English homes. Their switching often produced incorrect statements which resulted from adding an expression or rule appropriate only to forming questions in French, to English questions as well. From her evidence, Swain proposed common storage for the two languages in which the appropriate language tag would be added to the elements stored as differences between the languages were learned. She assumes that early mixing of two languages by young children is due to lack of differentiation rather than interference and that mixing disappears at the stage at which a child differentiates the two languages. However, the children in Swain's samples were from bilingual homes where the two languages were mixed. Thus there remains the possibility that

the observed lack of differentiation was due to the bilingual home situation and is not a necessary phase that all children exposed to two languages pass through.

Although this issue has not been resolved it is still reasonable to assume the universality of a stage in young children, that of not differentiating between two languages. Not differentiating implies mixing languages which would appear to be a symptom of a compound bilingual system. Perhaps it is only at a later stage of learning, when two languages can be differentiated, that co-ordinate bilingualism can exist. Perhaps it is only the degree of efficiency with which any existing system is used that changes.

In theory, the distinction between compound and co-ordinate bilingualism is reasonable, but in practice, separating two languages may be an impossible task outside of a controlled laboratory setting.

Age and Second Language Learning

Another theoretical question is the age at which a child should be introduced to a second language. For example, it is generally thought that young children can learn another language more easily than older children or adults because they are still able to produce the variety of sounds required in different languages, are more likely to imitate, and are less likely to be conscious of making errors. In addition it has been suggested that a young child's mental flexibility is greater since he can treat the new forms and rules of a second language like new rules of his first language, which he is still learning, without forcing them into previously learned patterns that may be inappropriate. Thus young children may pick up new languages more unconsciously and may achieve a greater degree of native-like pronunciation than older children and adults.

Further information on this topic may be obtained by referring to Penfield (1967), Saif and Sheldon (1969) and Ayala (1971). A trend toward beginning second language programmes in the junior elementary school grades has followed from this knowledge.

On the other hand, older children and adults may be personally motivated to learn a second language and can rely on their fluency in their mother tongue to facilitate their acquisition of an additional language. Their additional experience may compensate for their loss of flexibility in sound production and of mental flexibility, (Perren, 1972).

The method of teaching a second language of necessity will vary with the age of the students. For younger children, the language is generally introduced directly without translation through stories, songs, rhymes and other classroom activities. Older children may benefit from additional information about the grammar and structure of a language since they can relate this to information they already possess.

Influence of Bilingualism on Intelligence

Another question often raised concerns the influence of bilingualism on the intelligance of the speaker of two or more languages. Both verbal and non-verbal intelligence measures have been considered; however, armchair thinking has resulted in two diametrically opposed theories. From one point of view, it was hypothesized that bilingualism is an asset in concept formation and abstraction since it would encourage the separation of thought and meaning from words, their physical referents (Peal and Lambert, 1967). On the other hand it was hypothesized that bilingualism is harmful because knowing more than one referent for the same concept could create mental confusion because

of lingual interference and actually retard learning (Jenson, 1962; Peal and Lambert, 1967).

In general, studies prior to 1960 on the effects of bilingualism on intelligence may be broken down into three groups: those finding no difference in intelligence between diglots and monoglots; those finding an advantage for monoglots in either verbal or non-verbal intelligence; and those finding advantages for diglots.

Reviews of the studies investigating the relationship between intelligence and bilingualism are abundant; the reader may wish to refer to the following: Jenson, (1962); Taylor (1970); Peal and Lambert (1967); and Macnamara (1966). The consensus of opinion is that none of the early studies were properly controlled. Bilingual and monolingual subjects often differed in age, sex and socioeconomic status. Adequate and consistent measures of bilingualism were also not generally used. For example, students in the United States were assumed to be bilingual if they had a Spanish surname, or if they had been instructed in a second language. Proficiency in the two languages was not rated so it is quite conceivable that some of the younger children who were tested were barely capable of expressing themselves in any language.

Defining and measuring bilingual ability is one of the important details which should be considered. Closely related to it is the cultural background of the children being tested. If it is different from the monolingual culture on which most tests have been standardized, the tests themselves should be carefully examined for cultural bias. In view of the inseparability of language and culture, the cultural experiences of a "bilingual" person are

inevitably unlike those of his monolingual peer. Thus there is no guarantee that differences between groups can be attributed to linguistic differences alone.

Even the language of testing must be taken into account. Many of the "bilingual" children have been selected from non-English-speaking or immigrant families. Is it then preferable to test in the child's first language in which he has had no formal instruction, or his second language which he has not yet mastered? Both may provide an inaccurate estimate of his real ability.

Peal and Lambert (1967) tried to settle the controversy about the influences of bilingualism on various aspects of intelligence. In a well-controlled study, they made certain that their two samples did in fact consist of bilingual and monolingual children by clearly defining bilingualism as balanced ability in the two languages. Children in their study, all from French backgrounds, were judged to be balanced bilingual on the basis of four different criteria: giving an equal number of associations to stimulus words in both languages; detecting equal numbers of French and English words embedded in sequences of about fifteen letters; meeting a specified criterion on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in English; and rating oneself as being able to speak, understand, read and write the two languages equally well. Socioeconomic status, age and sex were controlled. A variety of intelligence tests was administered, including both verbal and non-verbal components.

On non-verbal subtests requiring concept formation, or symbolic flexibility, the bilingual students were superior; on spatial or perceptual tests, there were no differences in performance between the two groups. Overall, the bilingual group performed significantly

better on most of the verbal and non-verbal subtests which were administered.

Macnamara (1966) criticized Peal and Lambert for relying on the Peabody Vocabulary score in English, which is also a measure of I.Q., as the determining factor in selecting the bilingual children. He felt that this created a serious bias toward including only the brighter children in the study.

Lambert and Anisfield (1969), however, refuted Macnamara's attack by explaining that the vocabulary score was necessary to eliminate those children whose abilities in French and English were balanced but minimal. They had been further assured by the teachers that repeating the vocabulary test in French was unnecessary. In addition, the French achievement of the monolingual and bilingual students, as measured by school grades, did not differ, adding support to Lambert and Anisfield's claim that their bilingual sample was not biased. They therefore maintained, on the basis of the obtained intelligence measures, that bilingualism has not been shown to negatively influence intellectual development.

Two more recent studies in this area report advantages for those who are bilingual, not in the traditional domain of intelligence tests but in specific cognitive functions. Liedtke and Nelson (1968) found that bilingual grade one pupils scored higher in a series of Piagetian conservation tests than their monolingual peers, matched for age, sex, intelligence, socioeconomic status, and previous education experience. That is, their level of cognitive functioning was at a more advanced stage because of enriched environmental experiences.

Ianco-Worrall (1972) also found that young bilingual children were at an advanced stage of cognitive functioning in the area of semantic development. Children from four to eight years of age were presented groups of three words orally, and were asked to pick the two which belonged together. The bilingual four-to six-year-olds in her sample made more selections of words that belonged together semantically while monolingual children relied more on phonology for their choices. For older children there were no differences in the number of semantic choices, suggesting a temporary advantage for bilingual children in this task. In the Piagetian tasks too it would be relevant to know whether the advantage in cognitive functions for bilingual children could be maintained through later stages of development.

Immersion Programmes in Canada

Bilingual education programmes in Canada, especially those started in more recent years, have been concerned about the effects of bilingualism on intelligence. Because of the desire that bilingually instructed students not fall behind their monolingually instructed peers in academic performance, evaluative components have been incorporated into many bilingual programmes.

Immersion programmes are directed toward children of English and French-speaking parents who want their children to become fully bilingual in Canada's two official languages. For example, in a French immersion programme, children have the opportunity to use the new language (i.e. French) as a tool for communication. Barik and Swain (1972; also Swain and Barik, 1973) discuss this as one of the main reasons for

implementing second language instruction as early as possible, and in an intensive way. The following is one model of a French Immersion programme: during kindergarten and grade one, the teacher uses only French and the children, who initially speak only English, gradually replace it with French, the language of instruction in the classroom. The curriculum is generally the same as other programmes at the same grade level and information about French culture is added. One hour each day of English language arts is introduced in grade two and the programme in English is gradually increased in successive grades until French and English are used equally. By grade five, the programme is half English and half French.

Barik and Swain's evaluation included a comparison group of Ottawa students who had received instruction for twenty to thirty minutes each day in French as a second language. After statistical adjustments for age and I.Q. differences, testing at the end of grade one revealed that the French immersion group scored higher in aural comprehension of both French and English. No differences emerged in mathematical ability which was measured in English but the immersion group was behind in English word knowledge, discrimination and reading. Lambert, Just and Segalowitz (1970) reported similar lags early in an immersion programme and also observed that they disappeared by the end of grade two. Considering that no instruction in English had been given at this stage, the lags were not very surprising and the transfer from French to English had been remarkably great. Performance of the French immersion children on tests standardized for native French speakers was in the low average range.

A similar evaluation, conducted by the Ottawa Separate School Board (Edwards and Casserly, 1972), compared the effectiveness of

teaching French to English-speaking pupils for seventy-five minutes per day, for twenty to thirty minutes per day, or through an immersion programme. Pupils in grades three through eight were in twenty to thirty minute second language teaching periods, while those in grades one and two were in the two more intesive French programmes.

The French immersion programme in the Ottawa Separate School Board delays the introduction of English language arts to grade three, but begins teaching religion in English in grade one. In addition, in kindergarten, instruction may be in either language so that the immersion programme does not formally begin until the first grade, when parents have the option of enrolling their children in the seventy-five minute programme or the immersion classes. In comparison to the seventy-five minute programme, more of the students in immersion classes had received French instruction in kindergarten. In addition, the French immersion classes contained fewer students of neither French- nor English-speaking backgrounds than did the seventy-five minute programme. Beyond these points, there were no descriptive differences between the groups entering the two experimental French programmes.

The only differences which emerged in the test performance of the primary grade students were not surprising. The seventy-five minute group excelled only on some of the English language subtests, while the immersion group had higher achievements in French. Both programmes yielded satisfactory performance in French and the immersion group was able to transfer its French instruction to English tests.

Perhaps the most interesting finding was that primary students in the more intensive French programmes had attained as great a knowledge of French as senior elementary students who had been instructed in French for several years for twenty or thirty minutes per day.

A report by Burstall (1972) indicated that eight-to thirteen-year-old children in England, learning French as a second language for twenty to thirty minutes daily, show no deficits in English vocabulary skills or other areas of the curriculum. In summary, twenty to thirty minutes of French instruction has no detrimental effects, although this evidence suggests that it is not the most effective method of instilling French communication skills.

There are further indications of the success of the French immersion programme. After being in a grade one French immersion class, the pupils were as accurate and efficient in decoding and encoding messages in both French and English as were matched monolingual pupils in the two languages (Samuels, Reynolds and Lambert, 1969). Giles (1971) reported above average performance in tests of verbal ability throughout elementary school for students in a French immersion programme. Spelling problems which had been anticipated did occur in the earlier grades but decreased later.

Lambert et al. (1970) used novel techniques to test French immersion students after grade one and two in comparison with monolingually instructed French and English-speaking pupils. On word association tests in French, immersion students gave similar numbers and types of associations as the monolingual control students. As judged by native French speakers, immersion students' knowledge and pronunciation of French phonemes was rated average to good. The immersion class was also able to create intelligible stories in French, although they had more grammatical errors and somewhat poorer expression than the French control group.

The authors stress that the experimental French immersion class was not a select group and even contained two children judged to have "perceptual problems." Even these two progressed at a normal speed.

They add that perhaps the immersion situation provides an equal opportunity for all children since their starting points are more nearly alike. However, there has been very little research on how individual differences relate to performance in an immersion programme.

Although the developmental patterns of bilingually and monolingually instructed children are different in the early elementary grades, due to differences in language emphasis at this stage, introducing a second language intensively to young children appears not to have any lasting detrimental effects on academic performance. Its effectiveness in achieving bilingualism seems rather impressive.

Two Unsuccessful Bilingual Programmes

Two relatively large scale bilingual education programmes suggest that an intensive model cannot be universally applied. Both have been established for a long time and are teaching two official languages. Their results at face value do not favour bilingualism, although other factors such as attitudes and motivation may also be involved.

In Acadia, Nova Scotia, Chiasson (1962) attempted to find out whether bilingualism was an asset or a handicap to the native French-speaking students learning English. The children were in grades four to nine and monolingual English-speaking children were included as a control group. For the bilingual children, French was their native language. All children completed the Pintner Non-Verbal I.Q. Test, and the American School Achievement Test. Data from two counties, Richmond and Inverness, were examined separately.

In Richmond County, where the students were more truly bilingual, there were no significant differences between monolingual and bilingual students in the senior grades. However, in Inverness County, the results gave a different picture. In I.Q., the differences

favoured the bilingual students. Despite their intellectual advantage, the bilingual students scored lower than the monolingual students in many achievement subtests in the lower grades and by grades seven, eight and nine were still behind in some verbal subtests, namely, Paragraph, Sentence and Word Meaning, and Reading. They were ahead in some of the Arithmetic subtests.

It should be mentioned that the monolingual pupils of both Acadian counties also scored below the national norms on most parts of the achievement test. In other words, none of the groups examined was really performing as well as desired, but the bilingual students, on the whole performed worse than the monolingual children. Although the author discusses several reasons for the performance levels, including poor attendance records, inadequacy of teacher training and supplies, community attitudes, overenrolment, and an unusually heavy reading load especially in bilingual classrooms, the fact that all tests were administered and completed in English, the second language of the bilingual pupils, could also be a contributing factor.

Chiasson also describes some of the differences between the successful teaching of second languages in European countries and the relative failure in Acadia. She attributes the success of European methods to their relevance and interest for the pupils, to delaying instruction until the mother tongue has been mastered (usually grade three or four), and to the excellent teacher training specifically geared toward bilingual instruction. At the time of evaluation, Nova Scotia lacked all of these.

In Ireland, the situation is somewhat unique. At a time when over ninety per cent of its population was monolingual English-speaking, the Irish language was reinstated (Macnamara, 1966). The result was that English was still the language of the country while Irish was learned only

in school for political and cultural reasons. Since 1921, with the establishment of the Irish Free State, the method, time and value of introducing Irish into the curriculum has been a major controversy (although until Macnamara's publication, neither side had considered providing experimental support for their views). In 1963, a Commission for the Restoration of the Irish Language recommended continuation of the balance of forty-two per cent instruction time in Irish in the first six years of primary schooling including extended use of Irish for teaching other subjects.

Macnamara's research was confined to an examination of achievement in English and Irish language and in arithmetic which constitute the major emphasis of the curriculum in the primary grades. His conclusions may be summarized briefly as follows: native speakers of English taught in Irish have a poorer command of written English than students in England, and of written Irish than native Irish-speaking students. The native Irish speakers have the lowest performance in written English. In arithmetic, native English speakers taught in Irish are behind in problem solving ability but not in mechanical arithmetic which is less dependent on language. The analysis was carefully controlled for such extraneous factors as age, I.Q., sex, socioeconomic status and teacher experience and qualifications.

Outside the realm of bilingualism, many factors were offered by Macnamara to account for the differences in test performance between Irish and British students. Test sophistication, motivation, environmental experiences, test bias and teaching methods were among these.

Perhaps another factor not mentioned but worth considering is the opportunity to use the two languages. English is the language of the working population; Irish is stressed in school. Conflict is therefore inherent in Irish education and motivation to learn the second national language is likely to be low. For the children of Ireland, the outcome is hardly encouraging, but exposure to two languages alone may not be responsible.

Attitudes and Motivational Factors

The assessments of bilingual education projects discussed so far have dealt almost exclusively with achieving language goals and academic success. Considering the importance of changes in attitudes toward and understanding of other language communities, and changes in self awareness and self worth as possible by-products of a bilingual education system, it is surprising that these social influences have not received much attention in many research studies.

Peal and Lambert found that the attitudes of the bilingual group from French-speaking backgrounds toward English-speaking people were more favourable than were the attitudes of the monolingual French-speaking children. Although it would be very nice to conclude that one's attitudes become more positive as one learns more about another group's language and culture, there can be another interpretation since no pre-measures of attitudes were taken. Favourable attitudes might encourage learning the new language. Possibly, both forces are in effect simultaneously.

Positive attitudes toward the members of the other language group are an important aspect of successful language learning since they strongly influence motivation. Gardner (1968) distinguishes between integrative motivation, the desire to interact with members of the other language community, and instrumental motivation, the wish to get ahead in school or in a job. Although instrumental motivation is sufficient for using a language to some degree, perhaps in a mechanical or rote way, the desire to integrate or interact is more likely to increase the ability to communicate successfully and fully in the language. Barkman (1969) cites as evidence a study by Gardner and Lambert showing that students with integrative motivation achieved greater success in learning their second language than those with instrumental motivation.

A learner's motivation may be influenced by many individuals

in different ways. For example, parents who actively support the acquisition of a second language by encouraging their child to study it are affecting instrumental motives. Their passive role, their attitudes toward the community whose language the child is learning, is somewhat more subtle but is important in developing integrative motives. In very much the same way, teachers, peer groups and the community may affect the motivation to learn a new language.

Two Types of Children Learn Second Languages

Equally important in influencing whether or not an individual will become bilingual must be the attitudes of the target language group toward the learner's language community.

At this point, it is necessary to distinguish between two types of students who may become bilingual. So far in this paper, only the person who already speaks the dominant language of the country when he begins school, has been considered. For example, the English-speaking child in Ontario, or in the United States, or the French-speaking child in Quebec, or the Spanish-speaking child in Mexico would fall into this category. These individuals might have the option of learning a second language at some point in their schooling. Their second language will usually be one of their own or their parents' choice.

The second category is filled by those who begin school speaking only their native language which is a minority language of the country. Examples are abundant: the Italian-or German-speaking Canadian, the Spanish-or Indian-speaking American, and the English-speaking Mexican represent only a few. For these groups, it is compulsory that they acquire a second language. They must learn the dominant language of their country as soon as possible when they start attending school in order to function successfully in the world outside of their home.

The Immersion Model for Minority Language Students

In an over-simplified analogy, these minority language group children are entering an immersion programme in the dominant language. The analogy is over-simplified because the differences are very significant but often not reflected upon.

The first difference is that there may be only a single minority language child in one classroom. This means that he alone is struggling to learn a new language in addition to the contents of the curriculum which are presented entirely through a medium foreign to him. Everyone else, required to cope only with the curriculum contents, is at a relative advantage. Therefore, in contrast to the situation in the immersion programmes previously considered, all children do not begin at the same starting point. The minority language child is behind. Second, the curriculum and teaching methods are not specifically designed to teach a new language, but only to teach content material. The child must therefore grasp a new language and culture osmotically. Even though a child's first language appears to be acquired through osmosis, the second is rarely (Perren, 1972; Vygotsky, 1962).

A third difference, which is a consequence of the first two, is that the child is missing the contents of the curriculum presented in a language which is foreign to him all the time that he is learning the language of instruction. This is also true if he is taken out of his own class until he has learned the language. School failure is an almost inevitable consequence and evidence to support this outcome is sadly abundant (Cottrell, 1971; Modiano, 1966; Gudschinsky, 1971; Keith, 1969; INCCA report, 1969; Valencia, 1970). The child's native language and potential bilingualism serve as a handicap to his educational performance.

The fact that failure is not due to the absence of achievement is adequately demonstrated by the average performance of the same children when tested in their native tongue. For example, Zirkel and Green's (1971) investigation of Puerto Rican students in the United States showed that their performance, when given the opportunity to respond in Spanish, was significantly better than when responding in English, furthermore, it was not different from that of a control group of English-speaking pupils. This finding leads to the conclusion, that failure can be attributed, at least partially, to language deficits.

For balanced bilingual individuals, who are equally proficient in both languages, the language of testing may not be important. Kessler (1972) and Carrow (1971) have shown that the developmental sequence of comprehension of syntactical structures is remarkably similar in both languages for children who are bilingual in Italian and English, and in Spanish and English, and parallels that of monolingual children. However, without formal instruction in one's native language, and with an inadequate comprehension of the dominant language, an individual is very unlikely to be a balanced bilingual. In this case, the language in which ability is assessed may often be of critical importance.

A fourth integral distinction lies in the fact that the minority language child is not understood by his teachers or his peers, so that until he acquires their language he will be at an extreme disadvantage in classroom interactions. This could have dire social-emotional consequences, such as low self worth and frustration.

Finally, his own language will not be gradually introduced after two or three years, as is the case in the French immersion programmes. The message reinforced once again, is that it is wrong to speak his native language in school.

In speaking of minority language children, Sealey reminds us:

> "It is important for the teacher to realize that the young -- pupil does not live in a language vacuum. He has been raised and learned to communicate in a highly developed and satisfactory language. He has a full commitment to this language and all that it implies. He has, as a result of that language, a fully developed set of concepts, a way of categorizing things and a way of thinking."
>
> (Sealey, 1971, p. 9)

Consequences of Dismissing Native Languages

What are the consequences for the minority language child? It is not necessary for him to be bilingual; the message he receives is that it is sufficient to speak the language of the school. He is almost being asked, albeit in a subtle way, to reject his native language. Furthermore, since language is an integral part of culture, rejection of culture may easily accompany language rejection.

Of course he may still become bilingual and bicultural through encouragement from outside his educational environment. Moving back and forth between two languages and life-styles, especially the latter, may at times be very difficult if the appropriate behaviours tied to each are inconsistent. For example, a girl whose culture teaches her to be silent and submissive in the presence of adults could easily be accused of insolence in the classroom when she fails to answer.

Another serious consequence is that parents often complain when their children neglect their culture, lose respect and even refuse to speak their language (Meyerson, 1969; Brault, 1964; Levine, 1969). The conflict exists not only within the family; but extends to the relationship between parents and the school which is seen as the agency pulling children away from their parents. Although the school's influence

may be no more than to praise a child for speaking the language of the school and to fail to understand his native language; the following quotations reveal feelings of disruption, anger and resentment:

> "When society forces a youngster to use a second language and to forget his mother tongue, it is tearing up roots and disrupting his innermost stability."
>
> (Jenson, 1962, p. 136)

> "How much it hurts a child to have his own language ignored in a class of strangers probably never will be measured by the social scientists."
>
> (Lind, 1973, p. 10)

> "Resentment is assured, as expressed by a graduate of San Antonio, Texas school system: 'Schools try to brainwash Chicanos. They try to make us forget our history, to be ashamed of being Mexican, of speaking Spanish. What they succeed in doing is making us feel angry and empty inside.'"
>
> (Ramirez, 1973, p. 139)

Or perhaps a feeling of worthlessness will prevail. Recently Chief Dan George expressed fear that his minority group may be able to contribute nothing to Canadian society.

> "And now you hold out your hand and you beckon me to come across the street. Come and integrate you say. But how can I come? I am naked and ashamed. How can I come in dignity? I have no presents. I have no gifts. What is there in my culture you value? My poor treasure you can only scorn. Am I then to come as a beggar and receive all from your omnipotent hand."
>
> (George, 1971, p. 13)

After having subtle negative messages reinforced for several years, the student when he reaches secondary school is permitted, ironically, to begin to learn a second language, possibly his first language. Often his native language is not in the list of acceptable teaching subjects. Even when it is, his initial advantage is lost

since it is unlikely that the student still has his original fluency in his first language. Furthermore, if there are any siblings in the home, the children will be even less likely to speak their parents' language (Clyne, 1970). Clearly this is not an efficient method of attaining the desired goal of bilingualism.

Trend Toward Native Language Programmes

In North America, a recent trend has been to start native language programmes with young children. Teaching more than one language to younger children is not a new phenomenon. Many European Counties start their pupils on the path to multilingualism quite early, usually after they are firmly established in their native language. Such a procedure is almost essential because of the close proximity of different language groups in separate countries and because there is often more than one official language within a country (Chiasson, 1962). For example, in both Belgium, with two official languages, and Switzerland with four, primary school instruction begins in the mother tongue which may or may not be one of the official languages. After a sound base has been established in the mother tongue, and when the child is still in primary school, a second language, one of the official languages is introduced gradually as the medium of instruction. Often a third language is also begun before a student enters secondary school.

In North America the situation is quite different. There are so many different languages represented that it is not feasible to make them all official and expect everyone to learn them. The Federal Government, through policy and money, has recently given increased encouragement and support to French-English bilingual education in Canada. Support of multiculturism is a different component of the Federal Government's thrust.

Teaching in other languages, usually the native languages of minority groups, has very recently been introduced in North America. The United States amended its legislation and on January 2, 1968 signed into law an act permitting bilingual education. Gaarder has indicated that the office of education has interpreted bilingual education officially to mean:

> "...the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction...for the same student population, in a well organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum, plus study of the history and culture associated with a student's mother tongue."
>
> (Gaarder, 1970, p. 164)

According to Andersson and Boyer, the act is intended to:

> "...conserve our language resources and to advance the learning of the child, irrespective of language. It seeks to make learning the objective of the classroom, using other languages in addition to English to accomplish this objective."
>
> (Andersson and Boyer, 1970, p. v)

Ramirez (1970, 1973) suggested that teaching in the native tongue be introduced for one or more of the following reasons: to permit a student to advance in other curriculum areas without falling behind while he is learning the national language and hopefully thereby to reduce the rate of dropping out later; to reduce the conflict that may arise between a child and his parents over language usage and cultural involvement; to enable or increase communication between parents and teachers; and, to teach and respect both languages and cultures. If fulfilled, these goals represent some of the advantages of second language programmes.

The enthusiasm and potential impact generated by the Bilingual Education Act are expressed in the following quotation:

> "It is encouraging that after centuries of imposing conformity, the diversity of the American culture is being realized and molded into a creative force rather than left as something to shame or at best patronize. The mother tongue is the best medium for a child to learn...before English and the American culture are introduced. Children feel more secure and the parents, whose words and ways are no longer demeaned, are more positive in their ideas of education for their children... The child in this kind of learning situation can become a literate, an advantaged bilingual, rather than a confused failure with substandard command of both languages."
>
> (Meyerson, 1969, p. 526)

Minority language groups must feel comfortable with the motivation behind native language instruction. An offer of native language instruction may be viewed as an attempt by the dominant language group to maintain their advantaged status quo, since knowledge of English is compulsory for successful competition in North America. For example, it is because of suspicious feelings of this nature that the American Council of Sioux Indians has prevented instruction in the Sioux language. As part of the ingredients necessary for success, Benton reflects,

> "Bilingual schooling, as part of bilingual education, presupposes an environment in which both languages are respected, and in which an informed understanding of the cultures which lie behind the languages is present or is sought."
>
> (Benton, 1973, p. 14)

As long as these conditions of mutual concern and respect cannot be met, and suspicions not laid aside, native language programmes cannot be successful. Distrust and negative attitudes are therefore possible disadvantages of native language programmes.

Early Experiences in Non-English-Speaking Nations

In offering instruction in native languages for minority language groups, the United States has followed the example of some of the Spanish speaking nations to its south. Gudschinsky (1971) describes three early experiences with native language programmes. In the Peruvian jungles, because Indian pupils were not learning when taught only in Spanish, some of the Indians themselves were trained to be instructors in their own language. Pupils spent two years learning to read and write their native language and then a third year in transition to literacy in Spanish. After these three years, they entered regular Peruvian classrooms continuing to use texts printed in both Spanish and the vernacular Indian for two more years. Only after these initial five years did they follow the regular curriculum in Spanish. While there was no formal evaluation, success of the programme was inferred from the number of graduates, some of whom even went on to university.

A second example, in Quechua Peru, followed a very similar plan but the transition to instruction entirely in Spanish was faster. In Quechua too, success was measured by the decrease in the number of pupils who dropped out of school. In addition, the academic achievement of the students who began with native language instruction was superior to those who had received monolingual Spanish instruction.

South Vietnam was the third region described by Gudschinsky to implement native language teaching for Highland people in order that they might benefit from their educational experience. The results were similar: fewer students dropped out of school, and they were more fluent in the national Vietnamese language than were former Highland graduates.

Even without formal evaluation, the success of these programmes was obvious. Gudschinsky discusses several factors which he believes were responsible for the success. The programmes carried the support and understanding of the entire community and the teachers were, for a change, members of the same community. For new students, the cultural shock was minimized and the child's sense of personal value and identity could be augmented. The pupils were able to develop a habit of success rather than failure because basic concepts in content subjects were developed in the mother tongue. Fluency in the child's own language was fully used in learning the skills of reading and writing and the focus on the mother tongue actually contributed to second language learning since reading skills could be used as a learning tool.

Modiano (1966,1972) investigated the efficacy of a comparable programme in Mexico. Specifically, she was interested in whether students who were first taught to read in their native tribal language would later read Spanish, the national language, with greater understanding than students who were taught entirely in Spanish. On two independent measures, the bilingually instructed students in three separate tribal areas surpassed the monolingually instructed pupils. A greater percentage of the students who were taught first in their native language were rated by their teachers as being able to understand what they read in Spanish, and the same group scored higher in a reading comprehension test devised by Modiano so that its content would be culturally relevant.

Modiano believes that reading in the mother tongue involves acquiring a single skill, associating written symbols with familiar oral symbols. On the other hand, learning to read in an unfamiliar language requires the additional skills of learning new words, sounds and meanings.

The Language in Which Reading is Introduced

Gray (1969) demonstrated that good readers, regardless of language and orthography, show remarkably similar characteristics in the skill involved in reading. This adds some weight to Modiano's belief that reading should be introduced in one's native language. Gray measured eye movement patterns, and frequency and duration of eye fixations during both silent and oral reading. His description of reading as perceiving words, grasping meanings, reacting to what is read and applying the ideas acquired, is also independent of language or script.

Consistent with Gray's research, is the transfer of reading skills which was observed in the French immersion programmes. It should be noted however, that in the French immersion programme, reading and writing begin in the children's second language and not their mother tongue. Clearly in learning to read, other factors besides the native language must be in effect simultaneously.

The programmes described both by Gudschinsky and Modiano all introduced reading in the native language. However, reading has not been isolated from other factors, namely that all other information was presented in the native language. It is therefore not possible to conclude for these programmes whether it is better to introduce reading in a child's native language or in a second language. To resolve this issue, one would have to compare the effectiveness of two programmes: one in which reading was introduced in the native language; the second in which reading was introduced gradually with the second language, with all other conditions remaining constant. In reviewing the literature, no comparisons of this nature were found.

Other aspects would also need to be considered before deciding in which language reading should be introduced. For example, it may depend on the two specific languages involved. Gray describes three forms of written representations: word-concept or ideograph; syllable-sound or syllabary; and letter-sound. Whether transfer would be easier between two languages within the same representational form than between two different forms is an important, but unanswered question. Instances of transfer reported so far have been between French and English, Spanish and English, and Spanish and Indian languages which are all letter-sound representations. Even within a single representational system, transfer may occur more readily between languages that are more similar in pronunciation and vocabulary. Clearly more information is needed in this area.

Native Language Programmes in the United States

In the United States, during the first year of funding under the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 alone, seventy-six native language projects were started. Some of these use the mother tongue as a bridge to ease the transition to English as is the case with the programmes in the non-English-speaking countries mentioned above. The range in organization within the seventy-six programmes is quite great, however, and the other end of the continuum also exists: complete bilingualism for both minority and dominant language groups and continued instruction in both languages. Some indication of the variety in models and types of organization of bilingual education programmes can be found in reports by Gaarder (1967), LaFontaine and Pagan (1969), Ott (1968), and Ayala (1971).

Gaarder (1970) feels that unfortunately, very few programmes have fully qualified teachers, or persons who can fairly and fully

represent two cultures since they themselves are products of a system which the Bilingual Education Act was meant to correct. Many of the instructors themselves have had little or no formal training in their native language and may have been embittered by their own educational experience.

The [redacted]ients for successful bilingual programmes in schools can be stated briefly:

> "community support, well prepared teachers, adequate resource materials in both languages, and opportunities to use both languages outside the school gates."
>
> (Benton, 1973, p.14)

The ingredients sound simple enough, but as we shall see, many of the native language programmes in the infant stage have had some difficulties, although initial evaluations show some promising results.

Most of the minority language Americans are Spanish-speaking and consequently the second language projects in the United States are concentrated in the Spanish language districts. Ainsworth and Christian (1970) report on a Spanish and English kindergarten programme with bilingual teachers and aides who gave most of the instruction in Spanish. Testing revealed gains in both Spanish and English vocabulary by the end of the year. From taped conversations, the general impression gained was that verbal fluency increased and scores on the Draw-a-man test suggested that general intelligence also increased.

Unfortunately the major message informs researchers of the difficulties involved in testing children of that age level and since no comparison groups were tested, it is not possible to determine how significant the advances really were. Some of the testing itself was rather poorly administered further reducing the meaningfulness of the results.

All testing was conducted in the classroom with serious distractions, and the people who tested and interpreted the children's speech were untrained and did not use standardized or consistent procedures with all the children. The results emphasize the need to involve the teacher in the evaluation of a programme of this nature for young children and rely at least partially on observations of natural classroom situations.

Keith (1969) and Muller and Leonetti (1970) summarized evaluations of another elementary Spanish-English bilingual programme. This programme, in New Mexico, stressed the understanding and appreciation of cultural heritage by aiming toward fluency in both Spanish and English and building positive self concepts. From kindergarten through to grade three, the students stayed with the same instructor. Each year of the project, in the areas of mental ability, learning readiness, academic achievement, student attitudes and parents' attitudes and involvement, the bilingual group was assessed in comparison with both traditional and experimental English programmes. In the "experimental" English programme, while instruction was in English only, a bilingual aide was present to assist in comprehension when needed.

At the end of the fourth year, there were no differences on any mental ability or academic achievement measures among the three groups, and any lags the Spanish-English classes had demonstrated mid way in the project had disappeared. Considering that all testing was carried out in English, the initial lags of the bilingual group are not surprising since they had still received relatively little English language instruction. The fact that they did catch up is notable, and again reminiscent of Lambert's results with French immersion programmes.

Since Muller and Leonetti stated that their self concept data could not be meaningfully interpreted, no valid information on this aspect

of the students' progress was available. There were differences in parents attitudes and contacts with the school. Parents from experimental groups expressed more favorable attitudes and had more involvement with the programme than did parents with children in the traditional programme. Parental involvement took the form of parent-teacher conferences, teacher-class demonstrations, home visitations, instructional workshops and parent study groups.

In another study, Skoczylas (1972) found that after two years of bilingual instruction with equal time for Spanish and English, Mexican-American pupils had more favorable self images than did monolingually instructed Mexican-Americans. Their skills in oral English did not differ but the bilingually taught students ranked higher in Spanish oral ability. On a primary mathematical test in English, however, the control group scored higher. Perhaps the bilingual class had been taught mathematics in Spanish, and had not yet mastered the same content-specific concepts in English. Because the English language skills of the two groups were not different, it is likely that the lag of the experimental class was temporary. The need for longer term follow-up evaluations and for controlled separation of testing from language is once again made clear. The main advantages of this programme seem to be in personal development and maintenance of the native language.

Another programme in New Mexico (Cordova, 1970) concentrated on teaching in both Spanish and English for four years, beginning in kindergarten, to Spanish-speaking children only. Evaluations included tests of achievement and parental involvement and attitudes. At the end of grade one, students in the regular programme had made greater gains in achievement test scores but by the end of the following year,

there were very few differences and neither the regular nor the experimental programme children were consistently ahead. The parents of students in the bilingual programme had contacted the school more frequently than the other parents but did not differ in their attitudes toward education.

Another project in California was directed at improving Spanish and English languate skills by providing home instruction before kindergarten for eighty Spanish-speaking children (Bilingual Education Project, 1972). After six months of instruction in English as a second language, the children were taught equally in Spanish and English. The school curriculum for kindergarten to grade two reinforced the development of skills in both languages, while the eighty children remained together. No English-speaking children were included in these classes. The report contains only descriptive and no evaluative information.

Zirkel (1972) describes and evaluates a set of programmes for Puerto Ricans in grades one to three in Connecticut. The first, a bilingual model, involved Spanish instruction for a significant part of the curriculum with English presented as a second language. The second, a quasi-bilingual model, had children receiving only limited instruction in Spanish for a short period each day by an itinerant teacher. The control group, enrolled in a regular programme, received instruction in English as a second language.

The bilingual group showed more improvement over the regular control class than did the quasi-bilingual group. In grade one, their self-concepts were more favourable and in grades two and three, on academic measures in both Spanish and English, they scored higher. Furthermore, as determined by interviews, parents of children in the bilingual programme were better informed about the nature of the programme their children were in.

Whether the differences in favour of the bilingual group were attributable to Spanish instruction time is not ascertainable from the information provided since other major discrepancies also existed in conjunction with this detail. For example, instructor discontinuity, that is, switching teachers back and forth for young children, is one major distinction which must be considered as a possible contributor. A second factor is that if the regular teacher in the quasi-bilingual model did not understand Spanish, his pupils were effectively in a "regular" programme for a substantial part of the time, that is, the pupils had to rely on English in the presence of that teacher.

Not all bilingual programmes have been set up during the school year. A short-term summer programme (INCCA Report, 1969) was developed for Spanish-speaking children who had already been branded as learning problems for one reason or another. After six weeks of cultural, educational, social and recreational experiences, English and Spanish test scores had increased significantly, and fewer students remained in the "academic risk" category. Even this very short experience helped the students to recognize and value their own culture, and stresses the needs of minority groups or minority language community children which are often not met by a regular school programme.

Not all bilingual education programmes in the United States are directed toward Spanish-speaking children. For example, in Utah, Navajo Indians comprise a significant part of the population, and in twenty-two per cent of their homes, English is never spoken (Cottrell, 1971). Before a native language project was introduced, these children generally had been kept in grade one for an extra year so that they could catch up in speaking and understanding English. The aim of the bilingual

education programme was to prevent this automatic academic retardation, to build more positive self images, and to involve and communicate with the parents. English was taught as a second language while curriculum content was presented in Navajo.

The Navajo children in the project were compared on self image, oral English and a readiness test, to both an English speaking group and a Navajo control group. However, the latter group had significantly more contact with the English-speaking majority before and outside of school. In performance, the Navajo children in the experimental project fell between the other two groups but did not differ significantly from either group on any measures. However, the Navajo controls did have poorer self-images than the English controls and also fell behind them on some of the academic measures. These results suggest that the project Navajo children were somewhat better off with initial instruction in their native language since in a regular programme it would be expected that their performance at best would be like that of the Navajo controls.

One-Way Versus Two-Way Bilingual Programmes

The above projects had in common the aim of using the native language as a bridge to make, for example, Spanish-speaking children fluent in English. They did not also involve teaching Spanish to English-speaking pupils; that is, the bilingual instruction was one-way or in one direction only.

A one-way language programme would be easier to carry out since language teaching is directed toward a more uniform group. Imagine a two-way language programme in which Spanish-speaking children were learning English at the same time that English-speaking children were learning Spanish. In this situation, a different approach from that in

a one-way programme would be necessary to prevent each group from becoming restless or bored while sitting through the elementary lessons in their own language. Although this does not represent an advantage for one-way programmes, it does indicate a need to consider the two as different from the point of view of curriculum. For both, a bilingual teacher would be necessary.

Which programme is more desirable must depend on the goals of the programme and the ability to have it implemented, based on legal and administrative considerations. If the programme is used strictly as a bridge to eventual instruction entirely in the dominant language, directing attention only toward the minority language group would be a practical approach. However, even with a transitional goal in mind, it might still be an option to include some dominant language children in the class in order to increase the amount of English used. Under these conditions one would expect the dominant language children to acquire a minimal and fleeting knowledge of the minority language since teaching the minority language is not a goal. A transitional programme would be temporary; once the gap is bridged instruction continues only in the dominant language.

If the goal is to maintain the minority native language, a one-way programme might again be expected. Unlike the transitional programme, some form of instruction in the native language is continued. If terminated, this maintenance programme in practice becomes transitional. It should be noted that the opposite is also possible; if a transitional programme is continued, it may become a maintenance programme.

Possible negative effects of teaching only to a minority group might be, for example, the development of the attitude that one's native

language is not significant enough for the dominant language group to be concerned with. Separation of the two groups may emphasize this aspect.

If the goal is bilingualism in both directions, a two-way programme might be expected. A two-way language programme is likely to imply respect for each other's language and each other, and is most likely to foster favourable attitudes among language communities. However, the effects of intergroup contact on attitudes has not been resolved. In addition, in relation to the bilingual programmes this issue has not received much attention. Another factor to consider is that a two-way programme which has the support of more than a single minority language group, may be more likely to continue.

From the literature reviewed, in the United States, one-way language programmes seem to be more common, a possible reflection of more complex administrative and curriculum procedures with two-way programmes.

Two-Way Bilingual Programmes

There are some programmes which do come somewhat closer to offering bilingual education for two language groups simultaneously, that is, a two-way model.

Valencia (1970) documented an experimental kindergarten programme aimed toward three different language groups in Nebraska. The programme had three components: oral English instruction for speakers of non-standard English; reinforcement of concepts in the native tongue, either Spanish, Sioux or English; and oral Spanish instruction for all English-, Spanish- and Sioux-speaking children. Vernacular instruction with the Sioux-Americans had to be carried out informally because the American Council of Sioux Indians opposes instruction in their native language.

To determine the effects of the programme, tests in English oral language achievement, Spanish oral proficiency and intergroup attitudes were administered to the three ethnic groups in the experimental programme. A control group of children not exposed to the experimental programme was also tested. In English, all the mean scores favoured the experimental group, although only their pronunciation was significantly better than that of a control group. Gain scores over time were also greater for the experimental group.

The results of oral Spanish fluency testing must be viewed cautiously both because of the instrument itself and because of the scoring indices used. It is probably safe to conclude that both English and Spanish speaking pupils improved in Spanish-speaking ability.

Measures of intergroup attitudes taken before and after the programme revealed that attitudes were quite positive initially, and did not change significantly in the course of the programme. Parental attitudes toward education and their expectations for their children were also quite favourable. There were no significant differences in the way the parents of experimental and control children answered their questionnaires.

Because the time of operation was limited to one year at the kindergarten level, it is difficult to assess the programme accurately. However, for the same reasons, the small gains in oral English ability are probably very significant.

In San Francisco, a bilingual-bicultural education project was initiated for both English-and Spanish-speaking children (Dillon, 1971). Each group was taught the other's language as a second language for three years from kindergarten through to grade two. Children were tested in both their native and their second language.

In the native language, gains were greater for the English-speaking children, and in the second language, for the Spanish-speaking children. In other words all children advanced more in English than in Spanish. All advances were however average or better than average for the period of interest. Dillon suggested that the greater gains in English proficiency could probably be attributed to the influence of out-of-the-classroom experiences which would have been predominantly English. To offset these outside influences, Dillon felt that Spanish instruction should be stressed to encourage truer bilingualism.

Comparisons in oral English were made with children enrolled in another programme, the District bilingual programme, for which no description was offered. The Spanish-speaking children in Dillon's project ranked higher in kindergarten and grade one but by grade two the two groups of Spanish speakers did not differ. More meaningful comparisons could have been added by testing some children from the same background in regular classrooms and by including some description of the District bilingual project.

Spanish-and English-speaking children in Colorado are also learning each other's languages from bilingual teachers and aides. Simmons' (1971) final evaluation report, however, leaves much to be desired as it is more nearly a document of how not to conduct an evaluation. None of the children had ever been in a test situation before, the group tests were too difficult, and children copied answers. Furthermore, the tapes of children's speech were inaudible due to technical problems and no comparison groups were included. In other words, no objective measures of the programme's success are available. Nonetheless, the instructors and directors all felt subjectively that the programme was worthwhile and should be continued. Perhaps later evaluations would be more informative.

The ideal in a bilingual educational model is perhaps well represented by Coral Way (Gaarder, 1967 and 1972; Valencia, 1969). Half the students are native speakers of Spanish who have no option but to become bilingual; the other half are English-speaking American children whose parents, by opting for the programme, displayed a desire to have them become bilingual. Gaarder and Valencia indicate that the programme instructors are well qualified in both languages and have the full support of both the community and the administration. Based on measures of achievement, by the time students have reached the fifth grade, they were learning equally well through either medium, Spanish or English. The plan for the future is to continue using both languages as instruction media at least throughout elementary school.

Overview of Native Language Programmes in the United States

"The bilingual programme...recognizes that children of minority language groups have languages and cultures worth cherishing and sharing". (Sampson, 1971, p. 11). Teaching minority language community students, who had not been deriving maximum advantage from the educational system, in their mother tongue was introduced as a compensatory measure and from the information available, apparently has been a successful technique. At least no clearly negative results were reported in any of the projects. The main positive effects seem to be enthusiasm, increased parental involvement, increased positive feelings of self worth for the children in the programmes, as well as increased fluency in their native language. As expected, lower levels of achievement in English, in comparison to suitable control groups, were often found. Generally, these lags were temporary, and disappeared after several years.

Throughout the descriptions and discussions of the various projects, one cannot help but notice the enthusiasm with which the programmes were greeted by parents and educators alike. Often where books were not available in the student's native language or even about his culture, whether for reasons of budget or supply limitations, students and teachers together enthusiastically created, recorded and transcribed their own reading materials. Where bilingual instructors were not readily available, paraprofessional community members were brought in to assist in language aspects of class routines (LaFontaine, 1971).

Another interesting finding associated with the bilingual programmes is that parental involvement has been higher than with regular instruction programmes (c.f.,Cordova, 1970; Muller and Leonetti, 1970). One exception to increased parental involvement was noted by Picchiotti (1969). Parents were not particularly well represented at Open House and paid very few visits to the classroom. Their lack of response was partly attributed to their satisfaction with the programme, and to the expense of public transportation for these welfare recipients, but not to a lack of interest. Furthermore, the parents were kept informed about the programme by a school community representative.

In other words, administrative complexities, especially in the primary grades where most of the programmes are concentrated, can be greatly reduced by ardent and imaginative instructors, and a supportive community. These seem to be the most important ingredients for success.

Unfortunately since very few of the reports are really complete from a research point of view, that is, descriptions, evaluations and comparisons of curricula and programmes, it is not possible to say which methods or models are most effective. In some cases, evaluations lacked the appropriate and necessary comparison or control groups thereby

limiting the generalizability of the results. In other cases, the reports fail to describe the actual programme in detail making comparisons between projects impossible. In still other cases, evaluations were not carried out or were inadequate.

Fishman (1970) has criticized the bilingual education campaign for being an anti-poverty programme. Although necessary, he feels that it is insufficient because bilingual education should be available to all, not just the poor. To have it available to all, at the very least, would entail more two-way programmes.

It should also be noted that this is the inverse of the situation with French immersion. Many of the students enrolled in French immersion programmes, at least in Ontario, are from the middle socio-economic groups. Some educators have expressed concern about the ability to generalize the French immersion situation to lower socio-economic groups. In the native language programmes most students are from the lower socio-economic groups. These sampling factors make it difficult to generalize the effectiveness of both types of programmes.

Funding is, of course, a necessary consideration. A full bilingual programme requires at the very least an adequate supply of curricular materials in two different languages. Often these are not even obtainable in the target languages.

Even if one project did get off the ground, duplication might not be possible because of lack of additional funds. This situation could be frustrating both for a School Board and for communities desiring such programmes. Restricting programmes to the lower grades and to only a single language group would also imply reducing the money necessary to fund a project but this could convey the impression that one language group

is being favoured. Funding from outside agencies through research or other grants is usually temporary and often insufficient to meet the needs of even short-term programmes.

The fact that most of the projects are temporary or short-term introduces a new dimension to the problem: the effects of taking the native language instruction away from pupils who have had it for two, three or four years, or the effects of taking it out of the community after a single age group has gone through a single cycle of the programme. None of the programmes give any indications of where its graduates will go, whether they will return into traditional classrooms or will continue to receive instruction in two languages. In the long run, more harm than good might come if they were suddenly robbed of what was fulfilling their needs, although the effects might not be discovered for several years. Community reaction would probably be severe if programmes were ended abruptly. Stopping the programmes would also contradict any intention of creating advantaged bilingual students.

Another consideration is that a programme must fall within legal bounds. For example, if a school administration act allows instruction in only certain languages, many native language programmes could not be implemented.

The Situation in Canada

Very few examples of native language programmes, at least within the public educational system, were found in Canada. The legislation governing languages used in teaching is quite specific. In Ontario, section 21, subsection (e) of the Schools Administration Act, under the duties of teachers, states:

"(e) in instruction and in all communications with the pupils in regard to discipline and the management of the school,

(i) to use the English language, except where it is impractical to do so by reason of the pupil not understanding English, and except in respect of instruction in a language other than English when such other language is being taught as one of the subjects in the course of study, or

(ii) to use the French language in schools or classes in which French is the language of instruction except where it is impractical to do so by reason of the pupil not understanidng French, and except in respect of instruction in a language other than French when such other language is being taught as one of the subjects in the course of study."

Because the above act is characteristic of other Canadian provinces, and because French and English have been endorsed as Canada's two official languages, programmes such as the immersion programme, in either English or French, are not only legal, but even encouraged. However, at the same time, native language programmes for non-French or non-English-speaking elementary school pupils are not generally available. For the most part, they are not even legally feasible.

One province, Alberta, officially altered its Education Act in April 1971 (Sampson, 1971) to permit instruction in languages other than French and English, and to allow other languages to be taught as subjects or to be used as media of instruction, provided that instruction in English is given simultaneously. To date, no school board in Alberta has implemented any programme in which another language (other than English or French) is used for instructional purposes, although some consideration is being given to introducing studies in which the Cree language may be used for instructional purposes.[1] However, since the education of many

---

1 Lamoureux, P.A., Associate Director of Curriculum, Department of Education, Province of Alberta, Personal Communication, Oct. 29, 1973.

native Canadian Indians falls under Federal jurisdiction, there may be different provisions for native Indian language programmes.

The Situation in Toronto

In Toronto, the situation for ethnic community citizens is beginning to change. Their demands for maintaining their language and cultural traditions are being heard. They have already taken the initiative in organizing after school classes for their children and are demanding school time to teach native languages.

The extent of interest in second language programmes in the City of Toronto is reflected in a recent survey of parents of almost 39,000 public school children.[2] The survey revealed that eighty-five per cent of the respondents would enrol their children in an optional French programme or wish their children to continue taking French. In a section concerned with languages other than English or French, it was discovered that forty-four per cent would enrol their children in an optional "foreign" language programme. While some of this latter response was for a language as yet another subject in the curriculum, (i.e. Russian, Latin) most of it was the expression of interest in native languages and cultures by Toronto's ethnic groups.

In a project underway at the present time in the Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board, a handful of recent Italian immigrants from eight to thirteen years of age are receiving instruction in their content subjects in Italian while they are learning the English language as a subject (Henderson and Silverman, 1973). The project was approved by reason of it being impractical to use the English language because all the students did not understand English.

---

2 Background information and the results of this survey are summarized in Appendix A.

The two year programme is currently in its second year, and evaluations are still in process. Contrary to some expectations, the students are all highly motivated to learn and use English even though their teacher would understand them if they relied on Italian to communicate. Basal measures of I.Q. and achievement were established during the first year for both the experimental and a control group of Italian background children. Italian translations of tests were used. Measures of English language achievement will be obtained in the second year of the project.

The evaluators felt that some of the greatest advantages of the programme were the ones most difficult to assess objectively. For example, one boy who joined the experimental group only for the English language instruction period, was a quiet non participant in his regular classroom, but active, talkative and happy in the experimental group. Observations of this nature, even if informal, are probably the type that generate enthusiasm for native language programmes.

The Toronto Board of Education recently introduced one experimental project in the fall of 1973, and two others are expected to start in March, 1974.

The first project is a two-year transition programme starting in junior kindergarten for children of Italian background. The programme will rely on the children's native language and cultural experiences as the teacher initially will communicate mainly in Italian. English will be introduced gradually over the two-year period of transition. Both the teacher and the educational assistant are bilingual and they will remain with the same children throughout senior kindergarten. A research

component is associated with the project; descriptions of both the sample and the programme and evaluations are underway.

By the third year of school, it is expected that the children in the transition programme will be ready for the regular Grade 1 programme in which they may begin to read and write in English. It should be noted that this feature was shaped, in part at least, by legalistic considerations. Before the transition programme was implemented another proposal by a Toronto teacher was presented to the Board for consideration. This proposal included the introduction of reading and writing in the child's mother tongue. However, it was discovered that this would not be in accordance with the Schools Administration Act. Modifications were made to make the proposal legally feasible while attempting to preserve most of its features.[3]

Recently, the Ministry of Education has approved two other one-year experimental projects, at the elementary school level. One project involves instruction in Chinese culture and language, while the other is in Greek. In both cases the programmes will run for twenty to thirty minutes per day.

Other examples of special programmes for minority language children may occur on the initiative of individual instructors but no records of these instances are kept. It is clear that the trend toward bilingual education is growing and "realizing dreams that were always there. That dream [of bilingual education] has

---

3 Both proposals are discussed in a report to the Toronto Board which also contains general guidelines to follow when considering proposals for the study of languages other than English or French at the elementary school level (cf. Board Minutes May 3, 1973 pp. 316-318).

been dreamt ever since the days of the Pilgrims, because they came exactly in order to maintain themselves as they were rather than to change, and so did many groups since then. That has been [their] dream ... and it is high time that it came to be realized ... for immigrants and their children and grandchildren." (Fishman, 1970, p. 56)

SUMMARY

It is clear that before a second language programme can be introduced, several factors concerning the language environment must be considered: whether or not the second language is the child's native language (i.e., mother tongue); what languages are available and to what degree in the home, in the media and in the school; what attitudes various community groups have toward the second language and the programme.

Some indication of the extremes of community reaction to proposed native language programmes is provided in Appendix B. The arguments from both sides must be heard and considered. Second language programmes, especially native language programmes, require the cooperative effort of not only the educators and parents, but also the other community members, in order to be successful. Also to be included in the list of factors which must be resolved before second language programmes can be implemented are administrative complexities and financial and legal considerations.

The goals of any second language programme must also be given careful consideration. It is necessary for parents, instructors and researchers to know whether the goals are to have the children develop some degree of conversational competence in a language, to teach them to read and write a language independently of speaking it, to enhance the self worth of the pupils, to develop an appreciation and understanding of culture, whether their mother culture or another, or to develop fully bilingual individuals by

maintaining the native language or by teaching two official languages of a country, for example, French and English in Canada. Many combinations of these goals are possible.

The immersion model has been successfully applied with young children to achieve the goal of bilingualism in Canada's two official languages, English and French. In accomplishing this goal, immersion programmes, which provide intensive instruction in the second language, have been significantly more effective than less intensive programmes (e.g. 20 - 30 minutes per day).

Many children begin school in North America speaking a language which is the minority language of the country; Italian-speaking Canadians and Spanish-speaking Americans represent two examples. Many programmes utilizing the child's native language recently have been implemented in the United States.

Although many of these programmes are referred to as bilingual projects, it is often difficult to determine whether full bilingualism is actually one of the goals. In many cases, there is no indication of how long instruction in the native language will continue or how much time will be devoted to each language. Often the native language is used on a short-term basis to bridge the gap for instruction in English, to enhance the students' positive feelings about himself, his language and his culture, or to prevent academic failure.

In other words, many programmes have been established for very pragmatic reasons. Furthermore, testing conditions, materials and procedures were often inadequate, and in many cases, the samples involved were small. As a result, the literature to date is both

confusing and incomplete; thus, there are no satisfactory answers to many questions of a theoretical nature. This paper has attempted to organize information about some of the issues raised in connection with bilingual programmes, such as, the age at which a second language in introduced, the issues surrounding the separation of the contents of two languages, the relationship between intelligence and bilingualism, and the relationship between motivation, attitudes and language learning.

In spite of the fact that few issues can be resolved at this stage, some of the results are clear, and there are some concrete indications of the ingredients necessary for successful second language programmes.

From an academic point of view, the results may be summarized as follows: the children in native language programmes attain a greater knowledge of their mother tongue than those in traditional programmes. Children in immersion programmes successfully learn two languages, reinforcing the idea that young children can easily master more than one language. Generally, students also progress satisfactorily in all regular areas of curriculum and initial lags in the dominant language, when measured over longer periods, disappear in most cases.

It would seem then, that second language programmes are an advantage. In the case of immersion programmes, they can produce bilingual individuals and in the case of native language programmes, individuals with positive feelings toward their own language and culture. The alternative may be an individual who rejects his mother tongue and culture, leading to conflicts both in the home and the school. There is also some indication that children learning

two languages have greater cognitive flexibility than their monolingual counterparts.

The degree of bilingualism attained by students in second language programmes may vary with the emphasis in a programme. The results of the immersion programmes in Canada clearly indicate that bilingual fluency can be attained in an intensive language programme. In native language programmes, however, the relationship between intensity of instruction and linguistic fluency has not been investigated, possibly because bilingualism has not always been the goal of these programmes. Native language programmes have taken a variety of forms: some have used the native language on a short-term basis; others have attempted to maintain some degree of fluency in the native language; still others have been two-way programmes, offering instruction in two languages to two language groups simultaneously. Each variety implies different goals, organizations and outcomes.

Consistent with these variations is the emphasis of evaluation. Thus, immersion programmes have stressed linguistic and academic achievement. Some evaluations of native language programmes have been directed as much or more toward non-academic and non-linguistic aspects, to be more in line with their goals.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, C. L., & Christian, C. C., Jr. Lubbock bilingual elementary education program, evaluation report. (ED 065 213, RC 006 271) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1970.

Andersson, T., & Boyer, M. Bilingual schooling in the United States. Vol. 1. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Ayala, A. A. Rationale for early childhood bilingual-bicultural education. (ED 047 869, RC 005 094) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Barik, H. C., & Swain, M. Bilingual education project: interim report on the spring 1972 testing programme. Unpublished paper, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, 1972.

Barkman, L. B. Some psychological perspectives on bilingualism and second language teaching. McGill Journal of Education, 1969, 4, pp. 48-58.

Benton, R. A. Bilingual schooling for New Zealand children. Education, 1973, 22, pp. 14-16.

Bilingual Education Project. Bilingual education project, final report. (ED 067 182, RC 006 429) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

Brault, G. J. Some misconceptions about teaching American ethnic children their mother tongue. Modern Language Journal, 1964, 48, pp. 67-71.

Burstall, C. A study of the cognitive, affective and socio-economic factors influencing second language acquisition. (ED 060 756, FL 003 044) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

Carrow, E. Comprehension of English & Spanish by preschool Mexican-American children. Modern Language Journal, 1971, 55, pp. 299-306.

Chiasson, R. J. Bilingualism in the schools of eastern Nova Scotia. Quebec: Les Editions Ferland, 1962.

Clyne, M. G. Some aspects of the bilingualism and language maintenance of Australian-born children of German-speaking parents. ITL (Institute of Applied Linguistics) Review, 1970, 9, pp. 35-47.

Cordova, I. R. Evaluation of the 2nd year (1968-69) of the sustained primary program for bilingual students in the Las Cruces, New Mexico public school system. (ED 052 855, RC 006 497) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1970.

Cottrell, M. C. Bilingual education in San Juan County, Utah: a cross-cultural emphasis. (ED 047 855, RC 005 078) Washington, D.C., U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Dillon, P.L., Jr. San Francisco bilingual-bilcultural education project for Spanish/English speaking children, final evaluation report 1970-71. (ED 068 222, RC 005 078) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Edwards, H. P., & Casserly, M. C. Research and evaluation of second language programs: annual report. Ottawa: The Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board, 1972.

Fishman, J. A. The politics of bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Report of the twenty-first annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970, pp. 47-58.

Gaarder, A. B. Organization of the bilingual school. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, pp. 110-120.

Gaarder, A. B. The first seventy-six bilingual education projects. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Report of the twenty-first annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970, pp. 163-178.

Gaarder, A. B. Bilingualism and education. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), The language education of minority children. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers Inc., 1972, pp. 51-59.

Gardner, R. C. Attitudes and motivation: their role in second-language acquisition. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Quarterly, 1968, 2 (3), pp. 141-150.

George, Chief Dan. Dramatic soliloquy. Curriculum Bulletin, (Manitoba Department of Youth and Education), 1971, 6 (1), pp. 13-14.

Giles, W. H. Cultural contrasts in English-French bilingual instruction in the early grades. (ED 061 810, FL 003 037) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Gray, W. S. The teaching of reading and writing. Switzerland: U.N.E.S.C.O., 1969.

Gudschinsky, S. C. Literacy in the mother tongue and second language learning. (ED 060 753, FL 003 033) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Gumperz, J. J. Verbal strategies in multilingual communication. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Report of the twenty-first annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970, pp. 129-148.

Henderson, K., & Silverman H. A first language reception programme for immigrant students. Unpublished paper, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, 1973.

Hymes, D. Models of the interaction of language and social setting. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, pp. 8-28.

Ianco-Worrall, A. D. Bilingualism and cognitive development. Child Development, 1972, 43, pp. 1390-1400.

INCCA Report. A bilingual pilot project for foreign speaking children with language and cultural conflicts to evaluate present teaching methods and materials under a controlled educational situation. (ED 041 062, UD 010 266) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1969.

Jenson, J. V. Effects of childhood bilingualism (I & II). Elementary English, 1962, 39, pp. 132-143, pp. 358-366.

Keith, M. T. Sustained primary program for bilingual students. (ED 030 550 RE 001 850) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1969.

Kessler, C. Syntactic contrasts in child bilingualism. (ED 060 708, FL 002 958) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

LaFontaine, H. Para-professionals: their role in ESOL and bilingual education. (ED 053 591, FL 002 364) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

LaFontaine, H., & Pagan, M. A model for the implementation of the elementary school curriculum through bilingual education. (ED 066 934, FL 002 365) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1969.

Lambert, W. E., & Anisfeld, E. A note on the relationship of bilingualism and intelligence. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1969, 1 (2), pp. 123-128.

Lambert, W. E., Just, M., & Segalowitz, N. Some cognitive consequences of following the curricula of the early school grades in a foreign language. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Report of the twenty-first annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970, pp. 229-279.

Levine, H. Bilingualism: its effect on emotional and social development. Journal of Secondary Education, 1969, 44, pp. 69-73.

Liedtke, W. W., & Nelson, L. D. Bilingualism and conservation. (ED 030 110, AL 001 965) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1968.

Lind, L. New Canadianism: melting the ethnics in Toronto schools. This Magazine, 1973, 7 (2), pp. 6-10.

Macnamara, J. Bilingualism and primary education: a study of Irish experience. Edinburgh: University Press, 1966.

Macnamara, J. Bilingualism in the modern world. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, pp. 1-7.

Meyerson, M. D. The bilingual child. Childhood Education, 1969, 45, pp. 525 - 527.

Modiano, N. Reading comprehension in the national language: a comparative study of bilingual and all-Spanish approaches to reading instruction in selected Indian schools in the Highlands of Chiapas, Mexico. Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1966.

Modiano, N. Reading in bilingual education. (ED 065 000, FL 003 383) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

Muller, D. G., & Leonetti, R. A cumulative summary of the three years of the sustained primary program for bilingual students, 1967-1970. (ED 060 981, RC 006 012) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1970.

Ott, E. Instructional improvement program in language and reading for selected subculture groups in the southwest. (ED 026 228, RE 001 539) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1968.

Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. The relation of bilingualism to intelligence In J. Michel (Ed.), Foreign language teaching: an anthology. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967, pp. 143-191.

Penfield, W. The learning of languages. In J. Michel (Ed.), Foreign language teaching: an anthology. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967, pp. 192-214.

Perren, G. New languages and younger children. English Language Teacher, 1972, 26, pp. 229-238.

Picchiotti, N. Community involvement in the bilingual center. (ED 031 690, AL 001 775) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1969.

Ramirez, M. Cultural democracy: a new philosophy for educating the Mexican American child. National Elementary Principal, 1970, 50, pp. 45-46.

Ramirez, H. M. Multicultural education to make the nation greater. National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Bulletin, 1973, No. 373, pp. 138-142.

Saif, P. S., & Sheldon, M. E. An investigation of the experimental French programme at Bedford Park and Allenby Public Schools. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1969, (#75).

Sampson, G. P. Language deficit or language difference? Alberta English, 1971, 11, pp. 17-21.

Samuels, M., Reynolds, A. G., & Lambert, W. E. Communicational efficiency of children schooled in a foreign language. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, pp. 389-393.

Sealey, D. B. English language problems of Cree speaking children. Curriculum Bulletin (Manitoba Department of Youth and Education), 1971, 6, pp. 9 - 12.

Simmons, R. S. Final evaluation report for Colorado (City) bilingual education program, Colorado (City) Independent School District, Colorado City, Texas. (ED 064 022, RC 006 251) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

Skoczylas, R. V. An evaluation of some cognitive and affective aspects of a Spanish-English bilingual education program. (doctoral dissertation) (ED 066 990, FL 003 539) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

Swain, M. Bilingualism, monolingualism, and code acquisition. Paper presented at the Child Language Conference, Chicago, 1971.

Swain, M. Bilingual first language acquisition. Unpublished paper, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, 1972.

Swain, M., & Barik, H. C. French immersion classes: a promising route to bilingualism. ORBIT 16, 1973, 4 (1), pp. 3-5.

Taylor, M. E. An overview of research on bilingualism. (ED 049 876, RC 005 261) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1970.

Valencia, A. A. Bilingual/bicultural education: a perspective model in multicultural America. (ED 028 017, RC 003 341) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1969.

Valencia, A. A. The effects of bilingual/bilcultural instruction among Spanish-speaking, English-speaking and Sioux-speaking kindergarten children. A Report of statistical findings and recommendations for educational unit no. 18, Scottsbluff, Nebraska. (ED 043 415, RC 004 679) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1970.

Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and language. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Zirkel, P. A. An evaluation of the effectiveness of selected experimental bilingual education programs in Connecticut. (doctoral dissertation) (ED 070 326, FL 003 503) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1972.

Zirkel, P. A., & Greene, J. F. The academic achievement of Spanish-speaking first graders in Connecticut. (ED 054 275, UD 011 768) Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC, 1971.

APPENDIX A

Survey of Interest in French and Other Languages

SURVEY OF INTEREST IN FRENCH AND OTHER LANGUAGES:

Background

The following is an extract from the minutes of the Toronto Board of Education dated December 14, 1972:

> "(a) That a city-wide survey be conducted to determine the varying needs for French instruction in the Toronto Public Schools to serve as a basis for future planning of programmes.
>
> (b) That a comment be included on the first page of the survey form to the effect that, if the number of French teachers is increased, in most cases there will have to be a corresponding decrease in teachers in other areas."
>
> (Board Minutes, December 14, 1972)

The original form of the city-wide survey on French instruction was amended by the Board on January 18, 1973, to include a section concerned with languages other than English or French. The following questions were incorporated into this section.

> "6. If an optional course of 20 minutes per day were offered in a language other than English or French, would you enrol you child in this programme?
>
> YES NO
>
> 7. If you answered 'yes' to question 6, in what language would you prefer this instruction to be?"
>
> (Board Minutes, January 18, 1973)

The cautionary notation stating that programmes in French will not necessarily be implemented was generalized to refer to other languages as well.

The survey form and covering letter to parents,[1] was distributed to the pupils, in Junior Kindergarten to Grade 7, during the month

---

1 This material is presented on pages 65 and 66.

of February, 1973. In addition to the English version, translations in seven other languages were distributed.

Data from the survey were contained in two separate reports to the Board in early May, 1973. One report, from the School Programs Committee, focused on the implications of the survey results for French instruction. The second report from the Educating New Canadians Committee, dealt with the feasibility and the implications of implementing foreign language programmes and contained general guidelines to be followed when considering proposals for the study of languages other than English or French at the elementary school level.

Survey Results

Return Rate

Throughout the City, completed questionnaires were obtained for 38,787 pupils (in JK to grade seven inclusive). Since the total enrolment for this group was approximately 57,600 pupils (based on November, 1972 enrolment), the city-wide return rate was 67%.

Response to Optional French and Foreign Language Programmes (20 Minutes per Day)

Incorporated into the survey were two general questions, one asking whether parents would enrol their child in an option French Programme (20 minutes per day) and the second dealing with an optional programme in a language other than English or French.

Briefly reviewing the city-wide results, it was discovered that:

(a) 85% (n = 32,876) of the respondents would enrol their children in an optional French Programme or wish their children to continue taking French.

(b) 44% (n = 16,949) would enrol their children in an optional "Foreign Language" Programme.

Since 85% of the respondents would enrol their child in a 20 minute French Programme, for many respondents the information obtained was for a foreign language "as well as French". In other words, the results suggest that many respondents wish English, French and another language.

In analyzing the results according to the six academic areas,[2] the requests for French varied from 94% in Area 6 to 75% in Area 3. The requests for foreign languages went from 51% in Area 2 to 40% (Areas 5 and 6).

Response to 20 Minute vs. Immersion French for Kindergarten Pupils

Parents of children in Junior Kindergarten had a choice of expressing interest in two French programmes: the 20 minute per day programme and the total immersion programme.

Briefly reviewing the city-wide results, it was discovered that:

(a) 82% (n = 1,828) of the JK respondents would enrol their children in a 20 minute per day French programme.

(b) 36% (n = 813) would opt for the total immersion French programme.

(c) 18% (n = 411) would enrol their children in an immersion programme if it were available at a nearby school and they were responsible for arranging transportation.

These results suggest that roughly 50% (411 of 813) of the parents who indicated a preference for the immersion programme would arrange transportation to enable their child to participate. It should also be noted that in 13 schools thoughout the City, 50% or more of the respondents answered "Yes" to the question on total immersion.

---

2 Based on reorganization on July 1, 1972, the school system was decentralized with a geographic division into six academic areas.

Response for Specific Languages

Parents who expressed interest in an optional Foreign Language Programme were also given the opportunity to indicate their preferred language(s) (question 7 of the survey). The distribution of responses according to specific languages is summarized in Table 1 for the city and for each academic area.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF REQUESTS* FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESENTED
CITY-WIDE AND FOR THE SIX ACADEMIC AREAS
(THE LANGUAGES ARE PRESENTED IN RANK ORDER ACCORDING TO THE CITY-WIDE REQUESTS)

Language	City-Wide	Academic Area					
		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6
Italian	4060.0	297.0	1716.0	826.5	332.0	637.0	247.5
German	3049.5	590.0	254.0	174.0	536.0	658.5	837.0
Spanish	2549.5	337.5	271.5	183.5	448.5	409.5	899.0
Greek	1536.0	126.0	275.5	165.0	533.5	334.0	102.0
Chinese	1139.5	64.5	39.5	461.5	331.5	82.0	160.5
Portuguese	952.5	385.5	198.5	314.5	22.0	20.0	12.0
Latin	521.0	74.0	75.5	40.5	96.0	107.5	127.5
Ukrainian	448.5	314.5	48.0	18.5	23.0	31.5	13.0
Russian	374.0	77.0	25.0	16.0	32.0	59.5	164.5
Polish	369.5	272.5	36.0	8.0	30.5	10.0	12.5
Hebrew	94.0	1.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	73.0
Yugoslavian	60.5	20.0	13.5	5.0	12.0	9.0	1.0
Japanese	51.0	9.0	7.0	1.0	9.5	19.0	5.5
Hindi	43.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	11.0	9.0	5.0
Maltese	16.0	13.0	2.0	0	0	0	1.0
Other Languages**	283.5	71.0	27.5	24.0	68.5	44.0	48.5
Not Codeable***	1664.0	218.0	338.0	297.0	340.0	252.0	219.0
TOTAL	17212.0	2877.5	3337.5	2544.0	2831.0	2693.5	2928.5

* Since some answers listed more than one language, the first listed received a code of one, the second a code of one-half (0.5), as did the third listed.

** Includes all other languages, not meeting the criteria of at least ten requests per Academic Area.

*** Includes all answers involving non-specific languages, (e.g., "any language").

QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME OF PUPIL: _____

SECTION I — PLEASE ANSWER THE PART (A, B, OR C) THAT APPLIES TO THE CHILD WHOSE NAME IS ENTERED ABOVE.

PART A

Answer only if child is entering senior kindergarten in the fall of 1973.

1. If an optional, French Program (20 minutes per day) were offered in your school for kindergarten pupils, would you enrol your child in this program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. If an optional, total immersion* program in French were offered in your school for kindergarten pupils, would you enrol your child in this program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If the total immersion* program were made available at a nearby school and you were responsible for arranging transportation so that your child could attend, would you still enrol him/her in this program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

* A total immersion program means that all instruction in kindergarten and grade 1 is given in French. In grade 2, English is introduced and increased in grades 3, 4, and 5 until instruction is given 50 per cent in English and 50 per cent in French.

PART B

Answer only if child is entering grade 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in the fall of 1973.

4. If an optional French Program (20 minutes per day) were offered in your school, would you enrol your child in this program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART C

Answer only if child is entering grade 6, 7, or 8 in the fall of 1973.

5. If the regular French Program (20 minutes per day) were made optional next year, would you want your child to continue taking French? ☐ Yes ☐ No

SECTION II — THIS SECTION IS CONCERNED WITH YOUR WISHES FOR A COURSE TO BE OFFERED IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH OR FRENCH. ONCE AGAIN, THE SURVEY IS NO GUARANTEE THAT THE CHOICES MADE WILL BE INTRODUCED IN THE SCHOOLS. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT AT THE PRESENT TIME THE ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION DOES NOT PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR COURSES IN LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH AND FRENCH IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

6. If an optional course of 20 minutes per day were offered in a language other than English or French, would you enrol your child in this program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

7. If you answered "YES" to question #6, in what language would you prefer this instruction to be? _____

COMMENTS:

Name of School _____

Grade _____

SURVEY OF PARENT INTEREST IN FRENCH INSTRUCTION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE PARENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

At present, French instruction is offered in the public schools of the City of Toronto to all pupils in regular classes from grade 5 to grade 8 inclusive.

For a number of years, the French Department has recognized the need for greater flexibility in the kinds of programs offered in order to meet the varying needs for French instruction as expressed by parents in different parts of the City. In some areas, parent groups have requested a downward extension of the French program to grade 1; in other parts of the City, linguistic and cultural problems related to English as a second language have been of major concern to the pupils and parents.

Under the present conditions of increased parental demands for more French in some localities on the one hand, and of severe budget restrictions on the other, it seems to be an appropriate time to survey all parents concerning their wishes with regard to French instruction and to use the results of the survey as a basis for future planning. It should be clear that the survey is no guarantee that the choices made will be introduced in the schools. Any changes resulting from the survey will depend on competing demands for money and personnel.

The questionnaire on the back of the page has been prepared so that each question may be answered with a check mark (✓) in the corresponding box. Space has been provided at the end of the survey for any comments you might wish to add. One survey form should be completed for EACH child in your family who will be attending elementary school, that is senior kindergarten to grade 8, in the fall of 1973.

Since the various choices will require a personal commitment on the part of the student, it is hoped that he or she will be involved in the decision-making process. This is particularly true of pupils enrolled in grade 6 and 7 at the present time.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE BACK, AND RETURN IT TO THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL BY FEBRUARY 23, 1973.

Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated.

RONALD E. JONES,
Director of Education.

APPENDIX B

On December 6, 1973, the Toronto Star printed the article headlined: "Toronto schools try-out: Wells okays courses in Chinese, Greek."

On three separate days "Voice of the People" carried letters which commented, negatively and positively, on this article. This material is reproduced on the following pages.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Toronto schools try-out

Wells okays courses in Chinese, Greek

Education Minister Tom Wells has approved a Toronto Board of Education proposal to teach Chinese and Greek language and culture at the elementary school level during regular school hours.

Wells met yesterday for nearly two hours with a delegation of Toronto school officials, trustees and representatives of Greek and Chinese parents' groups.

The proposed one-year experimental project involves instruction in Chinese culture and language at Ogden and Orde St. public schools, and Greek at Jackman Ave. and Frankland public schools, for 20 to 30 minutes a day. It's expected to start in March.

Wells said other children apart from those of Greek and Chinese origin are entitled to participate. "That's one of the conditions; that it will be open to everybody.

Trustee K. Dock Yip, chairman of the board's special committee for educating new-Canadians said Wells' decision is a "very important step in the right direction. This way, children won't have to conform to an Anglo-Saxon culture. They won't feel inferior. They're part of the Canadian identity."

Both the public and the separate school system in Toronto operate experimental classes, teaching recent Italian immigrant children in their native language for a great part of the day. The transitional program involves using more English as the pupils master the language.

Toronto Star
Dec. 6/73.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teach students English not Chinese, he says

To the editor of The Star:

The Toronto Board of Education's proposal to introduce instruction in Chinese and Greek at selected public schools (Dec. 6) is an indication that some members of the board do not understand the purpose of elementary schooling.

A primary education is supposed to equip a child with some of the basic skills required to become a successful member of society. Contrary to what Trustee K. Doc Yip suggests, it is absolutely essential that a child growing up in this province not only master the English language but also be aware of Canadian cultural values. These things are important because, like it or not, they still represent the facts of life in Ontario.

The business of government, commerce, and industry is conducted in English; government publications, magazines, major newspapers, books, the theatre, the cinema, the universities, legal documents—all use English.

As an educator, every day I face products of the school system who are unable to read, write, and speak acceptable English. I feel especially sorry for some of the ethnic students because, although they are often top performers, many of them cannot find good jobs upon graduation. Employers just do not want to be bothered with people who can neither communicate effectively nor relate to their fellow Canadian workers.

I cannot help but feel that any program which de-emphasizes basic studies at the primary school level renders a disservice. New Canadian parents are being misled if they think that the teaching of their particular language and culture will help their children adjust to life in Canada.

F. R. FOULKES
Toronto

'No special treatment for New Canadians'

To the editor of The Star:

Minister of Education Thomas Wells gave permission to teach certain ethnic languages and cultures in some Toronto schools

Undoubtedly this is just a first step.

I can understand the desires of new Canadians to maintain links for their children with their countries of birth. But since they chose to come to Canada in the first place, they must expect to adopt a fair part of the Canadian way of life for their children.

These ethnic groups should take the same interest in this country that others have in the past. They have contributed to the enrichment of this country without needing special treatment.

Surely these ethnic groups can take the pride in themselves as people and in their families to arrange their own heritage and cultural development without official government programs.

I can say all this because I am also a new Canadian.

G. S. DENT
Toronto

'How far with this experiment?'

To the editor of The Star:

I live in an area with people of many ethnic backgrounds.

Now the Greek parents have permission to have special classes in Greek language and culture during regular school hours (Dec. 6). According to the news report, this was decreed by the Ministry of Education as an experiment.

Where does experimentation take off and the real thing come in?

In the meantime, what about the rest of us?'

Mrs. Y. SUYAMA
Toronto

"Voice of the People"
Toronto Star
Dec. 24/73

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Don't isolate New Canadians, educator says

To the editor of The Star:

I am very disappointed with Minister of Education Tom Wells' decision to approve Greek and Chinese language and culture to be taught in the schools during regular school hours.

How irresponsible! You cannot isolate new Canadians by giving them false security and make them different from other school children.

New Canadians must integrate. They must mix with other children and the sooner that occurs the better it is for them.

I speak not only as a teacher of English to New Canadians but, as one who has lived the experience of being a New Canadian student, and I can identify with their problems.

Instead of isolating the new Canadians and teaching them their own language and culture, why doesn't Wells expand the Teaching English as a Second Language program in areas needed? By providing more teachers and materials and by teaching them the English language and Canadian culture they will fit into the regular classroom of the school sooner and feel more comfortable with other children.

It appears that Wells has not balanced his decision logically or wisely; instead he seems to be grasping for votes from the immigrant communities by appeasing certain factions rather than concentrating on what is the best for the New Canadian child's development emotionally, academically, and psychologically.

FOTINI YAROSHUK
Scarborough

'Wrong philosophy for an educator'

To the editor of The Star:

As a participant in a meeting earlier this year in which the proposal to teach courses in Greek in two Toronto schools was explained to a group of concerned citizens by some of the educators who drafted the proposal, an interesting insight into the philosophy of some of our educators was revealed.

When asked: "What is the common language of Toronto?" one educator replied: "There is no common language; there are 55 indentifiable languages."

When asked: "Then what language would a Portuguese man and an Italian man communicate in?" the same man said: "They would not communicate."

If this is the type of thinking behind current educational programs in Toronto, then God help our children.

The man who made these statements takes real pride in developing this new program, now approved by minister of education on an experimental basis for two Toronto schools.

TOM SMYTH
Toronto

'Teaching of foreign languages shocking'

To the editor of The Star:

I am shocked at the recent decision to teach Chinese and Greek cultures and languages in Toronto public schools.

I have always felt that I should bring my children up as Canadians first preferably bilingual as Canada is bilingual and because this is the country where they are probably going to live and work when they grow up.

I also feel that it is my own responsibility to teach them about their heritage. This is not the community's or government's responsibility.

Now the government has decided to step in at the request of some people who do not have enough faith in this country to commit themselves to bring their children up as Canadians and who seem to need help in preserving their heritage.

H.R. VAN LOENEN
Toronto

"Voice of the People"
Toronto Star
Dec. 27/73.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE TORONTO STAR, Sat., Jan. 5, 19.4 F 3

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Another language will improve English says school trustee

To the editor of The Star

In response to the letters by F. R. Foulkes, Gr. 5 Dents and Mrs. S. Sivama (Dec. 21) I wish to express my reasons for advocating the bicultural bilingual immersion of young people in the elementary schools of Toronto.

The program of the Toronto Board of Education is an optional one open not only to the children of ethnic descendants, but to all children.

This program was initiated by the Greek parents of Frankland and Jackman Public Schools and the Chinese parents of Odgen and Orde Public Schools. The rationale for instituting this program is to close the generation gap between the children and their parents and to see the children retain some of their cultural heritage.

In many homes the children speak English while their parents speak their own vernacular. A little Greek or Chinese culture will enable the children to communicate better with their parents and their own communities.

Basic to all this is the fact that we cannot separate culture and language.

While I agree with Foulkes that the English language and culture are essential to survive in Canadian society, I do not agree that the original culture and language hinder a child's development in an additional culture and language.

On the contrary, I believe that a study of another language will improve their English knowledge, it will afford them an opportunity to compare the construction and syntax of sentences, and certainly it will broaden their views and outlooks on life.

Foulkes seems to underestimate the potential of the young people. In Europe people speak three or four languages simultaneously.

True multiculturalism, based on mutual respect and sharing, is not divisive. On the contrary, it can and should be a means of achieving national unity, as it eliminates any notion of inferiority or of a second class citizenry.

K. [illegible] VIP
Trustee, Ward 6
Toronto Board of
Education

'Second language builds respect'

To the editor of The Star

The proposal to introduce instruction of Chinese and Greek at selected public schools (Star, Dec. 2) is a great idea. I find groundless the protests of some English-speaking readers.

Also, I doubt if their letters (Star, Dec. 21 and Dec. 27) are really written on behalf of the new Canadians and their children.

I see it as a privilege every new Canadian can enjoy in this so good country, a privilege for an immigrant's child to learn that is, not to forget his own language, since he can pay more respect to it if presented under the aegis of his school and use it afterwards talking or writing to his own people. It is important that this privilege has to be granted officially by the authority of the public school. It will prevent the feeling of being a second or third class citizen.

He will not be ashamed anymore to speak the language of his parents and forefathers, but he will be proud of his roots, culture and heritage. It will make him realize that his parents are not "enemies" of the country because they speak no English.

[illegible]
Toronto

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

'English isn't being de-emphasized'

To the editor of The Star:

I wonder whether those who criticize the recent proposal by the Ontario Board of Education to teach Chinese and Greek in Toronto public schools understand the real issues involved.

They seem to argue that immigrants ought to learn English as soon as possible and that the proposed program de-emphasizes English in favor of another language that is of sentimental value only to new Canadians.

Unfortunately, this is not the issue. Most new Canadians whose native language was not English continue to speak their native language at home and their children are brought up listening to this language which they learn to speak at least as well as English in their pre-school days.

Once in school, however, they are only taught English, never learning formally the language spoken at their home. As a result, parents find it increasingly difficult to communicate with their own children as they grow older.

This is not so because parents don't speak English, which they obviously need in order to live in Canada, but rather because they still prefer to speak their native language at home and because there can be little communication between two different cultures living under the same roof.

Some parents try to solve the problem by teaching their children themselves the language and the culture of their home. Many send their children to private evening schools. Thus these children have less time to spend on their work for their day time school and they often find their evening classes a waste because their teachers are not qualified to teach and the classes are poorly organized. A check with the various ethnic groups around Toronto will convince anyone who cares to check that these are facts of life.

It is because of these facts that ethnic parent organizations have been asking the Toronto Board of Education for a long time to introduce other languages into the primary and secondary school program, in order to spare their children the inconvenience of attending two schools at the same time, and themselves the expense and the worry that their children are not taught properly.

They are not asking that English be de-emphasized; instead, they want to see schools offer additional courses which their children can take instead of other non-compulsory courses.

JOHN MYLOPOULOS
Toronto

'Second language no handicap'

To the editor of The Star:

F. R. Faulkes bases his opposition to the introduction of the Greek and Chinese languages on the grounds that such an expansion of curriculum would undermine the future success of these students in an English-speaking province.

I concede the need for a fluent working knowledge of the English language, however, the point in question here, is whether the teaching of Chinese and Greek, would in fact handicap (sic) English.

I assume that Faulkes, as the educator he claims to be, would then be familiar with the experiences of the other provinces and their policies of multilingual training at the elementary level. If his concern for new Canadians could only be put aside for a moment those programs examined, his uncertainties would be resolved.

The prairie provinces have multilingual language training programs which have shown over the years that such programs enhance the student's future prospects of success. The young student with multilingual training develops the capacity and flexibility to deal with a much broader range of intellectual, social and economic problems.

A society that fails to provide the means by which education can take place, forces the individual into a mold not of his own choosing, and thus we as a nation suffer.

We are a country that subscribes to two official working languages, and a multicultural identity. I accept and respect these principles; but principles no matter how lofty are merely empty words when not put into an institutionalized practice.

YURI KOVAR
Etobicoke

"Voice of the People"
Toronto Star
Jan. 5, 1974 (continued)